



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,234	08/21/2003	John R. Zalcski	2003P03508 US01	7160
7590 Alexander J. Burke Intellectual Property Department 5th Floor 170 Wood Avenue South Iselin, NJ 08830		01/23/2007	EXAMINER GRAY, PHILLIP A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER 3767
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/23/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/645,234	ZALESKI, JOHN R.
	Examiner Phillip Gray	Art Unit 3767

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 November 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15 and 18 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-15 and 18 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/07/06. 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to the applicant's communication of 11/7/2006. Currently, amended and newly added claims 1-15, and 18 are pending and rejected below.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/7/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the amended claims overcome the prior art of record, De La Huerga. Specifically, concerning the independent claims, applicant argues that De La Huerga does not disclose a network system for operating concurrently infusion pumps providing fluid infusion to a corresponding "**plurality of different patients in different locations**". It is examiners position that De La Huerga does disclose "providing fluid infusion to a corresponding plurality of different patients in different locations" (as described in rejection below).

Further all elements of the claims as currently written are disclosed and are fully capable of satisfying all structural, functional, operational, and spatial limitations of the claims. Therefore the rejections are proper and maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by De La Huerga (U.S. Patent Application Number US2002/0038392), herein after "Huerga". Huerga discloses a networked information system for controlling a plurality of infusion pumps. Huerga discloses a system comprising processors for acquisition of data, and data processing that are presented in a display image, which may display the status of the infusion pumps providing fluid infusion to a corresponding plurality of different patients in different locations. (see paragraphs [3]-[19], [186]-[234]).

It is examiners position that the added amendments of "providing fluid infusion to a corresponding plurality of different patients in different locations;" is disclosed and taught in Huerga. Through out the Huerga art reference is made to monitor and display

of concurrently operating pumps and devices. It is applicant's argument that Huerga only applies to a single patient. It is examiners position that De La Huerga applies to a plurality of pumps of concurrently operation infusion pumps to a plurality of different patients in different locations. Examiner draws applicant's attention to Paragraph [0273] and claim 42 for examples of operation of the device on a plurality of concurrently operating pumps on a plurality of patients in different locations. It is examiners position that the De La Huerga art use of the word "patient" or "single patient" is describing the function of the network system at the single patient level and that De La Huerga fully would be capable and encompass a plurality of patients, as evidenced for example at paragraph [0273] and claim 42 for instance. Any description of single patient would be at the one level of operation and multiple concurrent plurality of patients and pumps is fully capable and taught in De La Huerga.

Concerning the "single display image", Applicant has also amended the claims to include the limitation of "the display image includes a plurality of user selectable elements associated with said corresponding plurality of concurrently operating in fusion pumps and a display processor for initiating generation of data representing a single display image and a second image including parameters specific to a particular pump in response to user selection of a displayed element associated" with the pump. Examiner draws applicant's attention to processor (figure 26a at 620) and interactive menus of Heuga figures 27-29, 36, and 44 (variable parameters displayed at 291, 306,308,310, 304 for example). As per the reasoning and discussion above amended independent claims 1 and 12 are rejected.

Concerning claim 7 and the support for "User manual entry" operation and generation of a third image see paragraphs at [0155], [0256], [0291], and [0322].

Huerga discloses that at least one of the infusion related data may be shown by graphical representation on a first or second display (for graphical representations of display data discussion see paragraphs [0148], [0193], [0296]); that data may be one of (a) pump location, (b) pump access address, (c) pump start time, (d) pump flow rate, (e) a fluid identifier in a pump and (f) fluid volume dispensed; or (a) a current fluid flow rate, (b) fluid volume delivered, (c) a fluid identifier, (d) an authorizing physician identifier, (e) a fluid infusion time remaining indicator, (f) a particular pump IP address, (g) a current time, (h) a user selectable data refresh rate, (i) parameters specific to said particular pump and (j) a user selectable item supporting user manual entry of a fluid infusion related value (see figures 27-29 and paragraphs [112], [133], [273]).

Huerga discloses that display images include a plurality of user selectable links associated with a plurality of concurrently operating infusion pumps and said system includes, a display processor for initiating generation of data representing a second image including parameters specific to a particular pump in response to user selection of a link associated with said particular pump (see figures 6,18,27-29,35-42 and paragraphs [192]-[219]), and generation of a third image enabling at least one of; (a) a user to alter an existing infusion flow rate or fluid volume delivered value and (b) a user to add a new infusion flow rate or fluid volume delivered value (see paragraphs [273][294]).

Huerga discloses authorization processors which could limit the presentation of information images or access to operations of a particular pump (see paragraph [160-161],[216]). Huerga discloses that the data processor may provide data to at least one of, (a) a repository of electronic patient medical records for storage in a corresponding plurality of electronic patient medical records in said repository, (b) a pharmacy information system for use in re-stocking medications, (c) a medication order information system for use in monitoring use of particular fluid medications and (d) a patient management information system for use in monitoring patient usage of fluid medications ([112], [293], [320]). Applicants arguments are not compelling, for the reasons discussed above concerning multiple patents, the authorization system of Huerga is fully capable of satisfying the claim limitations of claim 8.

Concerning claim 14, Examiner **does not** take the applicant's position that there is a 35 USC 112 enablement disclosure problem with Huerga's "conversion processor". It is examiners position that the processor is disclosed and teaches the required structure, function, and operation to anticipate the elements and limitations of the applicant's claims. See rejection and discussion above and element 104 or 620 for example.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, **in the alternative**, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over De La Huerga (U.S. Patent Application Number US2002/0038392). Huerga discloses that the network for operating concurrently a plurality of infusion pumps could be connected to the Internet (see paragraph [149]), and be connected to an Internet Protocol (IP) compatible network where the pump access address is an IP address. Huerga discloses the claimed invention except for explicitly stating that the pump access address would be an Internet Protocol (IP) compatible network address. Huerga discloses that the network could be over the Internet, intranet, ect. It would be implied or implicitly known that the network and pump access addresses be Internet Protocol (IP) compatible.

If not anticipated by Huerga, one of ordinary skill would modify the Internet network and addresses to make them Internet Protocol (IP) compatible. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a pump access address, which would be an Internet Protocol (IP) compatible network address, since it was known in the art that provides a data-oriented protocol with the service of communicable unique global addressing amongst computers.

Contrary to what the applicants stated in arguments, It is examiners position that Huerga **does** disclose or teach “pump access address is an IP address”, and Examiner **has not** made any admission contrary to this. For the reasons discussed above, This is either a 102 rejection or in the alternative a 103 rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phillip Gray whose telephone number is (571) 272-7180. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Sirmons can be reached on (571) 272-4965. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

16
PAG

KEVIN C. SIRMONS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Kevin C. Sirmons